

Section	Summary/Subject	Solution	Anticipated Corrections for Errata Sheet or Addendum	Needed policy change per City Staff
Big Ideas to Improve Development Outcomes Across the Board				
	By zone, establish a "Minimum Developable Area" by area (e.g. downtown, corridor zones, transition zones, residential zones). Any and all City requirements that would otherwise cause the MDA to be reduced, must be scaled back until at least the MDA is obtained. The City could establish the hierarchy of City regulations that would be reduced in order to achieve MDA.			
	By zone, establish a "Maximum Total Development Fee Amount". Similar to above, any and all regional WQ and detention fees, utility fees, transportation fees, etc. would be capped at some amount (e.g. a percent of total construction cost or an amount per unit of development (residential unit or commercial sf?)). The City could establish a hierarchical of fee schedule, similar to above.			
	Require the key policy provisions that will be addressed in future criteria manuals be set forth in Code.			
Map-Related Recommendation				
	All properties within downtown except for those within the area exempt from bonus density per Figure 23-3E-2050(1) Downtown Density Bonus Program Map, should be zoned DC. All other properties should be zoned one of the CC subzones as shown on the Draft 2 map. Many downtown sites, especially those along the Waller Creek corridor along I-35 where density is most desired, are already limited by the significant height restrictions of the Capitol View Corridors and other restrictions that limit density in other various overlay zones. The code should be as generous as possible to allow for the full development potential of these sites. This is consistent with Imagine Austin's priority of locating the greatest density in regional centers and specifically in downtown.	All properties within downtown except for those within the area exempt from bonus density per Figure 23-3E-2050(1) Downtown Density Bonus Program Map, should be zoned DC. All other properties should be zoned one of the CC subzones as shown on the Draft 2 map.		A DAP plan amendment (or a special area district plan) would be required.
Chapter 23-1: Introduction				
Article 23-1A: General Provisions				
Division 23-1A-1: Title, Purpose, and Scope				
Division 23-1A-2: Authority				
Division 23-1A-3: Classification of Applications and Decisions				
Division 23-1A-4: Consistency with Comprehensive Plan				
Division 23-1A-5: Rules of Interpretation				
Article 23-1B: Responsibility for Administration				
Division 23-1B-1: City Council				
Division 23-1B-2: Boards and Commissions				
Division 23-1B-3: Administration				
Division 23-1B-4: Neighborhood Planning				
Chapter 23-2: Administration and Procedures				
Article 23-2A: Purpose and Applicability				

Section	Summary/Subject	Solution	Anticipated Corrections for Errata Sheet or Addendum	Needed policy change per City Staff
Division 23-2A-1: Purpose and Applicability				
Division 23-2A-2: Development Process				
Division 23-2A-3: Residential Development Regulations				
Article 23-2B: Application Review and Fees				
Division 23-2B-1: Application Requirements				
Division 23-2B-2: Review Procedures				
Division 23-2B-3: Fees and Fiscal Surety				
Article 23-2C: Notice				
Division 23-2C-1: General Provisions				
Division 23-2C-2: Notice Requirements				
Division 23-2C-3: General Notice Procedures				
Division 23-2C-4: Notice of Public Hearings				
Division 23-2C-5: Notice of Applications and Administrative Decisions				
Article 23-2D: Public Hearings				
Division 23-2D-1: Conduct of Public Hearings				
Division 23-2D-2: Timing and Location of Public Hearings				
Article 23-2E: Legislative Amendments				
Division 23-2E-1: Text Amendments				
Division 23-2E-2: Plan and Map Amendments				
Article 23-2F: Quasi-Judicial and Administrative Relief				
Division 23-2F-1: Variances and Special Exceptions				

Section	Summary/Subject	Solution	Anticipated Corrections for Errata Sheet or Addendum	Needed policy change per City Staff
Division 23-2F-2: Administrative Relief Procedures				
Division 23-2F-3: Limited Adjustments				
Article 23-2G: Nonconformity				
Division 23-2G-1: General Provisions				
Division 23-2G-2: Specific Types of Nonconformity				
Article 23-2H: Construction Management and Certificates				
Division 23-2H-1: General Provisions				
Division 23-2H-2: Subdivision Construction				
Division 23-2H-3: Site Construction and Inspection				
Division 23-2H-4: Certificates of Compliance and Occupancy				
Article 23-2I: Appeals				
Division 23-2I-1: General Provisions				
Division 23-2I-2: Initiation and Processing of Appeals				
Division 23-2I-3: Notification and Conduct of Public Hearing				
Division 23-2I-4: Action on Appeal				
Article 23-2J: Enforcement				
Division 23-2J-1: General Provisions				
Division 23-2J-2: Suspension and Revocation				
Division 23-2J-3: Enforcement Orders				
Division 23-2J-4: Appeal Procedures				
Article 23-2K: Vested Rights				

Section	Summary/Subject	Solution	Anticipated Corrections for Errata Sheet or Addendum	Needed policy change per City Staff
Division 23-2K-1: Petition and Review Procedures				
Division 23-2K-2: Vested Rights Determinations				
Division 23-2K-3: Expiration				
Article 23-2L: Miscellaneous Provisions				
Division 23-2L-1: Interlocal Development Agreements				
Division 23-2L-2: General Development Agreements				
Division 23-2L-3: Closed Municipal Landfills				
Chapter 23-3: General Planning Requirements				
Article 23-3A: Purpose and Applicability				
Division 23-3A-1: Purpose and Applicability				
Article 23-3B: Parkland Dedication				
Division 23-3B-1: General Provisions				
Division 23-3B-2: Dedication	The early determination process currently in the Parkland Dedication Operating Procedures should be moved into the code and also include civic open space as part of the determination.	The early determination process currently in the Parkland Dedication Operating Procedures should be moved into the code and also include civic open space as part of the determination.		
23-3B-2010	Dedication of parkland "cap". The cap should be expanded to 15% for all projects (regardless of size or location or required parkland dedication size) and the cap shall be applied to combined required open space (public and private) of any type; I.E. "No project shall be required to dedicate more than 15% of the net site area to open space of any type including, but not limited to, parkland dedication, civic open space, common open space, etc, whether public or private, however this should not limit a development from providing more open space for amenities associated with the development."	Dedication of parkland "cap". The cap should be expanded to 15% for all projects (regardless of size or location or required parkland dedication size) and the cap shall be applied to combined required open space (public and private) of any type; I.E. "No project shall be required to dedicate more than 15% of the net site area to open space of any type including, but not limited to, parkland dedication, civic open space, common open space, etc, whether public or private, however this should not limit a development from providing more open space for amenities associated with the development."		
23-3B-2010 (C)	Site Plan Dedication should include the following language "Parkland dedication that complies with this section shall be included in the gross site area for the parcel dedicating land. Zoning entitlements including but not limited to impervious cover and FAR shall be calculated on the gross site area prior to the parkland dedication"	Site Plan Dedication should include the following language "Parkland dedication that complies with this section shall be included in the gross site area for the parcel dedicating land. Zoning entitlements including but not limited to impervious cover and FAR shall be calculated on the gross site area prior to the parkland dedication"		
Division 23-3B-3: Fees				
23-3B-3010	Fee in lieu shall be allowed by right on corridors and within ½ mile of transit stops, as well as part of TOD sites less than 5 acres, by right.	Fee in lieu shall be allowed by right on corridors and within ½ mile of transit stops, as well as part of TOD sites less than 5 acres, by right.		
23-3B-3010	Clearly identify what is allowed within parkland such as water quality/detention features, fire lanes/parking, trails, landscape areas including mitigation compliance, functional green, etc.			
23-3B-3010	Need to clarify if "ceilings" can be allowed over any open space areas in urban districts.			

Section	Summary/Subject	Solution	Anticipated Corrections for Errata Sheet or Addendum	Needed policy change per City Staff
23-3B-3010 (A)	Allow for greater flexibility as to when parkland is dedicated, fees paid or a combination of the two.	Remove (2)		
23-3B-3010 (C)	Amend language to: A determination issued under this Subsection is valid for a period of one-year from the date of issuance and will not expire if a site plan application is filed within one-year from the date of issuance"	Amend language to: A determination issued under this Subsection is valid for a period of one-year from the date of issuance and will not expire if a site plan application is filed within one-year from the date of issuance"		
Article 23-3C: Urban Forest Protection and Replenishment	Proposal to include all tree protection standards including protected species list, preservation standards, mitigation requirements/standards into Code and not defer to technical criteria manual.	Language proposal to applicable sections: "No changes to this article shall occur without modification of this code section, as reviewed and approved by City Council."		
Division 23-3C-1: General Provisions				
Division 23-3C-2: Young Public, Keystone, and Protected Trees				
23-3C-2020	Proposal to add language that establishes preservation guidelines	Proposed preservation guideline language could include: a. Preservation of trees shall not be the cause of a request to relocate a building or reduce the proposed building or density of a proposed site plan b. Tree removal is allowed as required to achieve within 10% allowed impervious cover less required open space on all project sites. c. Projects along a corridor or within ½ miles of transit that preserve more than 25% caliper inches on site are only required to mitigate to 75% of code requirement.		
Division 23-3C-3: Heritage Trees				
Article 23-3D: Water Quality				
Division 23-3D-1: General Provisions				
Division 23-3D-2: Exceptions and Variances	Redevelopment exceptions shall be modified to remove any non-water quality related gate keeper requirements (i.e. total trips/day)	Redevelopment exceptions shall be modified to remove any non-water quality related gate keeper requirements (i.e. total trips/day)		
Division 23-3D-3: Impervious Cover				
Division 23-3D-4: Waterway and Floodplain Protection				
Division 23-3D-5: Protection for Special Features				
Division 23-3D-6: Water Quality Control and Green Stormwater Infrastructure Standards	Code should include exact language on allowed types of water quality controls for sites over 80% impervious cover	The phrase "other" in section 6030(E) should be replaced with details including "partial sedimentation/filtration ponds, sedimentation ponds, biofiltration ponds and wet ponds".		
23-3D-6030	Provision shall be included that a GSI water quality controls are optional along corridors and within ½ mile of transit or within TODs (only in urban and suburban watershed)	Applicant can chose to use conventional controls to optimize site density. Applicants in these zones that chose to use GSI shall be granted a relief from water quality treatment volume of 25% compared with a conventional control.		
23-3D-6040	Fee-In-Lieu: WQ Fee in Lieu shall be a by-right option for projects along a corridor, within ½ mile of transit and/or in a TOD, that are also in urban/suburban watersheds, where more than 60% site impervious cover is from the building footprint.	Fee-In-Lieu: WQ Fee in Lieu shall be a by-right option for projects along a corridor, within ½ mile of transit and/or in a TOD, that are also in urban/suburban watersheds, where more than 60% site impervious cover is from the building footprint.		
Division 23-3D-7: Erosion and Sedimentation Control				
Division 23-3D-8: Additional Standards in All Watersheds				
Division 23-3D-9: Save Our Springs Initiative				
Article 23-3E: Affordable Housing				

Section	Summary/Subject	Solution	Anticipated Corrections for Errata Sheet or Addendum	Needed policy change per City Staff
Division 23-3E-1: Citywide Affordable Housing Bonus Program				
Division 23-3E-2: Downtown Density Bonus Program				
23-3E-2030 (A) (2)	Design Commission evaluation for compliance with Urban Design Guidelines as part of Gatekeeper Requirements The Design Commission oversight for compliance with the Urban Design Guidelines was always intended to be an interim solution until design standards were codified, as they will be in CodeNEXT. It was always stated publicly that the commission would no longer evaluate compliance after codification. Design Commission oversight remains	Strike 23-3E-2030 (A) (2) Design Commission evaluation should be removed. It will no longer be necessary and was always intended to be a temporary solution.	Yes	While this level of detail may not be in the DAP, Council meeting transcripts can be used to verify the intent.
23-3E-2030(B)(6)	23-3E-1070 gives NHCD Director authority to recommend FIL or % units to City Council annually. 23-3E-2030 (B) (6) states that downtown fees may vary by use and district (ok). Claims nine districts, but unclear what those are.	NHCD Director should not be able to adjust without a proper, third-party calibration study. Applying some sort of index does not accurately reflect market conditions.		
23-3E-2060(B)	Does not appear to require "designated review group" for downtown, but does not indicate how projects receive approval for using community benefits other than affordable housing. This seems to be an oversight since downtown projects can currently earn density via a menu of options, as long as at least 50% of the bonus area is earned through providing housing on site or paying a fee in lieu. The only instance that should require PC/Council approval is outlined in section G, in which a project's developer proposes to provide a unique set of community benefits not outlined in code.	23-3E-2060(B) Proposed Code Language Administrative Approval. If the applicant chooses to achieve 100 percent of the density bonus by providing community benefits described in Subsection (C) through (F), the director may approve the density bonus administratively.	Yes, we anticipate this will be addressed by striking E and insert F in 23-3E-2060(B) as noted.	
23-3E-2070(B)(1)	5% on-site bonus To achieve density above 40 up to 8:1 FAR, we support continuing the on-site affordable housing requirement. However, a seemingly minor change to the code made in 2014 when the full Downtown Density Bonus Program was codified has a negative impact on the Rainey Street area. We support reverting to the on-site requirements in place before 2014, 5% of the number of bonus units (as opposed to 5% of the bonus square footage) be designated affordable to 80% Median Family Income.	A development in the Rainey Street Subdistrict may exceed the 40 foot height limit Subsection 23-4D-9140 (F)(7)(iii) and achieve a floor area ratio of up to 8:1 if at least five percent of the number of the dwelling units developed within that floor area ratio of 8:1 is available to house persons whose household income is 80 percent or below the MFI HOME Limits, as amended per household size, and as defined by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development for the Austin-Round Rock Metropolitan Statistical Area. The Housing Director conducts the income determination.	No	Should not require plan update; this 2014 change for Rainey Street was not found in the DAP and had the unintended consequence of negatively impacted Rainey residential projects.
23-3E-2070(B)(6)	Requiring a percentage of bonus area units to be affordable, AND requiring the affordable unit mix to match the unit mix of the building, make downtown residential with on-site affordable housing infeasible. Except for those that were already entitled and therefore exempt, no new residential projects have been built on Rainey Street after this requirement was imposed in 2014.	Strike 23-3E-2070 (B) (6)	No	Should not require plan update; this 2014 change for Rainey Street was not found in the DAP and had the unintended consequence of negatively impacted Rainey residential projects.
Missing	Missing - Commercial density bonus downtown	This may be addressed in the forthcoming Affordable Housing Criteria Manual. We recommend that the LDC program for non-residential projects be retained; any non-residential project meeting gatekeeper requirements is eligible for a 50% FAR bonus without further density bonus program obligations. After teh 50% baseline bonus, current calibration should determine the fee in lieu per bonus square foot. Calibration may or may not determine that the fee is equal to the fee in lieu for residential projects. Currently, the fee is set at \$0/SF, as market calibration at the time showed that there was not enough incremental value created to justify charging a fee for the bonus square footage.	During our meeting, Ian from EcoNW may have misunderstood the question. He gave a reference to the ability to earn up to 50% of the bonus SF via benefits other than housing.	
Missing	Missing - Ability to Appeal Current code allows applicant to appeal to the City Council if director determines that the gatekeeper requirements have not been met.	Replicate ability to appeal in LDC 25-2-586 (J) (1 - 3)	Did not mention yet	
Division 23-3E-3: Tenant Notification and Relocation				
Division 23-3E-4: S.M.A.R.T. Housing				
Division 23-3E-5: Additional Affordable Housing Incentives				
Division 23-3E-6: Affordability Impact Statements				
Chapter 23-4: Zoning Code	Code should remove all compatibility limitations for properties fronting corridors.	Code should remove all compatibility limitations for properties fronting corridors.		
Article 23-4A: Introduction				
Division 23-4A-1: Purpose				

Section	Summary/Subject	Solution	Anticipated Corrections for Errata Sheet or Addendum	Needed policy change per City Staff
Division 23-4A-2: Establishment of Zones				
Division 23-4A-3: Zoning Map				
Division 23-4A-4: How to Use the Zoning Code				
Article 23-4B: Zoning Administration and Procedures				
Division 23-4B-1: Land Use Approvals				
Division 23-4B-2: Code Interpretations and Use Determinations				
Division 23-4B-3: Zoning Map Designations and Amendments				
Division 23-4B-4: Criteria for Variances and Special Exceptions				
Article 23-4C: General to All Development				
23-4C	Clarification is needed as to which open space can be overlapped – should allow ALL types of open space to overlap!			
23-4C	Clarification as to cap on combined open space requirements			
Division 23-4C-1: Large Site Requirements				
23-4C-1010	Clarify which zoning categories are subject to common and civic open space in Section 23-4D-1010 (D)	Clarify which zoning categories are subject to common and civic open space in Section 23-4D-1010 (D) and then update the Open Space table in each zoning category accordingly. Ex. MS3A does not list civic open space as a requirement, but it appears that any site greater than 4 acres is subject to civic open space and not common open space. Table 23-4D-5110 (I) only lists common open space.		
23-4C-1030(B)	Amenity Required	– Edit as follows: A site that is one acre but less than four shall provide common open space that complies with the requirements established in Table 23-4C-1030(A) Open Space and Amenities). A site complies with this section, if: (1) [this would never happen as common open space is not required for sites greater than 4 acres and civic is only required for sites 4 acres or larger per section 23-4C-1010 (C) and (D)] Any land dedicated either in a recreation easement or otherwise to the City for parkland dedication complies with Article 23-3B (Parkland Dedication)		
23-4C-1030(C)(5)	should be deleted in its entirety. This is asking for additional open space triggered by the amount of open space dedicated.	Strike	Should be considered for Errata Sheet	
23-4C-1030(E)	Clarify, or consider revising or removing, the common open space requirement so it is more appropriate for and applicable to small sites. Clarify how 20' minimum dimension can be accommodated on sites with 10' maximum setback, where common open space is required at ground level.	Remove the Common Open Space standards from all of the Regional Center Zones (CC, UC, DC).	Opticos/City plan to remove the Common Open Space standards from all of the Regional Center Zones (CC, UC, DC).	
23-4C-1030(E)(4)&(5)	We clearly showed that tight sites need to have flexibility for where the open space is provided since open space is not required to be open to the public.	Remove the restriction on amount of open space that can be located on a balcony, roof, or other above ground area.		
23-4C-1040(A)	Edit as follows: "An applicant for a site plan or subdivision that results in one or more parcels greater than 4 acres must designate civic open space..."	Edit as follows: "An applicant for a site plan or subdivision that results in one or more parcels greater than 4 acres must designate civic open space..."		
23-4C-1040(B)	Edit as follows "Land dedicated to the City to meet the applicable parkland dedication requirements in Article 23-3B will contribute to satisfying the requirements of this section."	Edit as follows "Land dedicated to the City to meet the applicable parkland dedication requirements in Article 23-3B will contribute to satisfying the requirements of this section."		

Section	Summary/Subject	Solution	Anticipated Corrections for Errata Sheet or Addendum	Needed policy change per City Staff
23-4C-1040(B)(2)	Edit definition of net development site acreage to include street rights-of-ways, public sidewalks, required landscaping areas, parkland dedication, land located between the property line and a building setback, water quality features and detention areas not located within buildings.	Edit definition of net development site acreage to include street rights-of-ways, public sidewalks, required landscaping areas, parkland dedication, land located between the property line and a building setback, water quality features and detention areas not located within buildings.		
Division 23-4C-2: Civic Open Space				
23-4C-2020(D)	Strike this section as it conflicts with the requirements of section 23-4C-1010 as common open space and civic open space are triggered by size of the site and not required at the same time.	Strike this section		
23-4C-2050	Remove all parking requirements associated with required open space provided by private development.			
Article 23-4D: Specific to Zones	Clarify which zoning categories are subject to common and civic open space in Section 23-4D-1010 (D)	Clarify which zoning categories are subject to common and civic open space in Section 23-4D-1010 (D) and then update the Open Space table in each zoning category accordingly. Ex. MS3A does not list civic open space as a requirement, but it appears that any site greater than 4 acres is subject to civic open space and not common open space. Table 23-4D-5110 (I) only lists common open space.		
23-4D generally	Driveway widths for RM, MU, MS, and more intense zones should be set at 20ft (minimum) to ensure for adequate safety for two-way traffic and fire access.			
	In addition, amend language for all RM, MU, MS and higher intensity zones	Edit to read as follows: i. "When lot has adjacent alley with a right-of-way width of 20' or greater, parking must have at least one be access pointed only from the alley." This is found in 3100(F) in the Parking section of various zones.		
Division 23-4D-1: Purpose				
Division 23-4D-2: Residential House-Scale Zones				
Division 23-4D-3: Residential Multi-Unit Zones				
Division 23-4D-4: Mixed-Use Zones				
23-4D-4030(A)	Residential Care Facility is not listed as an allowed use for MU and MS districts and should be included. Foundation Communities single adult congregate living projects would be permitted under Residential Care Facility and their project at 2301 South Lamar, which is zoned MS3A, would not be allowed. This oversight should be fixed.	Residential Care Facility is not listed as an allowed use for MU and MS districts and should be included.	This should be considered for Errata Sheet	
23-4D-4100(H)	Function Green is listed as 23-4E-4080 but it is 4120. This is repeated throughout multiple zoning categories.	Fix section reference	This should be considered for Errata Sheet	
Division 23-4D-5: Main Street Zones				
23-4D-5110(3)	Height is calculated to the top of the parapet rather than the roof (see diagram, L label) This will likely remove a story from a building as the mechanical equipment is required to be shielded, thus a parapet is required.	Current code allows parapets to extend past the overall height. With the landscape buffer, compatibility setbacks and height step backs, this is not necessary and will only impact total number of units.		
Division 23-4D-6: Regional Center Zones				
23-4D-6030 At Table (A)(11)	Automobile Related, Parking Facility is listed as an allowed use by Conditional Use Permit. However, as referenced in (A)(2), the term parking facility is not defined in 23-3M Definitions and Measurements. Consider prohibiting surface parking lots as an allowed use in the Regional Center Zones.	Clarify if parking facility is a defined term in the code and provide the definition. It is not defined in 23-3M Definitions and Measurements. Parking facility should not include surface parking lots.	Clarify if parking facility is a defined term in the code and provide the definition. It is not defined in 23-3M Definitions and Measurements.	
23-4D-6040	There is confusion about the requirement for two curb cuts per block. Consider clarifying to two curb cuts per block face. Limiting driveways to 25 feet in width will be difficult to achieve on projects that require three parking access lanes and/or on projects which combine loading with their driveway access points. Consider adding exception language or increasing driveway width maximum. Curb cut requirements as written may force traffic to undesirable locations. Driveway location requirements may be different for visitors and regular users. Curb cut restrictions may sometimes force garage entry to locations that are not ideal for downtown traffic flow. Consider another mechanism for limiting and identifying the best locations for curb cuts, such as a district plan that better takes into consideration desired traffic patterns.	At (B) Parking Location Standards, (1) off street parking location standards: Remove (c) and (d) requirements. They reference districts that are undefined. Defer replacement requirements to a district planning effort. At (e) Increase driveway width maximum to 30' to allow for 3 lanes of traffic flow. Remove (2) Exceptions to Off-street parking location standards and (3) Parking location standards - corner sites in DC.	At (B) Parking Location Standards: Paragraph (1)(b) limits curb cuts to two per block; Opticos/City have agreed to change this to two curb cuts per block face. The other language comes from the DAP. Changes would require amendments to that plan.	A DAP plan amendment (or a special area district plan) would be required.
23-4D-6050(C) Exceptions to Off-Street Parking Location S	This can be considered inappropriate for urban sites. Clarify why and when this would apply to a regional center zone. Consider revising or removing for downtown zones.	Remove this provision from the Regional Center Zones (CC, UC, DC).	Opticos/City plan to remove this provision from the Regional Center Zones (CC, UC, DC).	

Section	Summary/Subject	Solution	Anticipated Corrections for Errata Sheet or Addendum	Needed policy change per City Staff
23-4D-6060(B)	Overview (2) conflicts with Table 23-4D-6060(B) Note 1 and the paragraph above it about ROW and utility easements.	Clarify the contradictions between Overview (2) and Table 23-4D-6060(B) Note 1 and the paragraph above it about ROW and utility easements.	Clarify the contradictions between Overview (2) and Table 23-4D-6060(B) Note 1 and the paragraph above it about ROW and utility easements.	
23-4D-6060(C)	Consider adjusting height limits to better accommodate common floor-to-floor heights. Consider adjusting 40' to 50' (4 floors); 60' to 75' (6 floors), 80' to 90'. Or, consider providing a height limit OR a floor limit. Height limits proposed do not align with common building heights based on standard floor-to-floor heights plus taller retail spaces on first floor. Providing maximum number of floors may be more flexible to limiting building height without penalizing buildings providing generous floor-to-floor heights.	CC subzones should allow for these height maximums: Replace CC40 with CC50; Replace CC60 with CC75; Replace CC80 with CC90.		A DAP plan amendment (or a special area district plan) would be required.
TABLE 23-4D-6060(A)	At FAR max: Consider increasing CC zone FAR maximums to better match or exceed allowable density under existing code. There are lots in the Northwest district of downtown, designated as CC-40 and CC-40 with FAR limitations of 1.0 and 2.0 respectively, that are not eligible for density bonuses. Consider applying the principles of the Downtown Austin Plan for this area: maintain compatibility with the two and three-story pattern of development. Also in the Downtown Austin Plan is a stated goal of Northwest District to incentivize housing over office/commercial. In reviewing sites in this area, it is apparent that allowing max FAR of 5:1 for all CC zones would make residential a more viable use, and removing the density bonus exemption could result in more affordable housing. Consider increasing the maximum density on these sites as part of an expanded density bonus, while maintaining the height limits that promote compatibility. It is recognized that a separate planning effort may be necessary for the consideration of these changes. Also, at AHBP bonus: clarify these numbers. They contradict the Downtown Density Bonus Program and provide much less additional FAR.	All CC zones should allow 5:1 FAR maximum. Change CC40, CC60, CC80 FAR max to 5:1. At AHBP Bonus: Clarify these numbers. They contradict the Downtown Density Bonus Program and provide much less additional FAR.	At AHBP Bonus: Clarify these numbers. They contradict the Downtown Density Bonus Program.	A DAP plan amendment (or a special area district plan) would be required.
TABLE 23-4D-6060(B)	Building Placement: The CC zone establishes a minimum setback of 5 feet on all sites, but the map in the Downtown Plan Overlay Zone described (23-4D-9080 as taken directly from the Downtown Austin Plan) has many streets with 0' setbacks. To simplify and clarify, consider removing the 5-foot minimum setback. This setback can create a significant impediment to development on small sites and does not allow downtown to achieve the density needed for regional centers, as stated in Imagine Austin. DMU zoning, which CC is meant to replace in the new code, does not require any setbacks. Therefore, this new regulation is effectively downzoning (reducing entitlements) as compared to the existing code. Also, Regarding "Additional setback and/or easement may be required where street right of way or utilities easement is required" - where is this addressed in the code? And, at Note 1: section referenced is Industrial Flex Zones and must be incorrect.	Remove all minimum setbacks for all CC zones. Clarify reference to easements. Note 1 section referenced is Industrial Flex Zones and must be incorrect.	Clarify contradictions between this section and 23-4D-9080 (D)(4) and Figure 23-4D-9080(2) - map with setbacks from DAP. Clarify reference to easements. Where is there information or a map of the easements? Correct section referenced in Note 1.	
TABLE 23-4D-6060(D) Height (1) All Buildings	At All Buildings: Consider adjusting height limits to better accommodate common floor-to-floor heights. Consider adjusting 40' to 50' (4 floors); 60' to 75' (6 floors), 80' to 90'. Or, consider providing a height limit OR a floor limit. Height limits proposed do not align with common building heights based on standard floor-to-floor heights plus taller retail spaces on first floor. Providing maximum number of floors may be more flexible to limiting building height without penalizing buildings providing generous floor-to-floor heights. Also, at Building Height Stepback: What/where is the preservation plan in the note? It is merely 6th Street and Congress Avenue?	At (1) All Buildings: Replace CC40 with CC50 (50' overall max height); Replace CC60 with CC75 (75' overall max height); Replace CC80 with CC90 (90' overall max height). At Building Height Stepback: Clarify preservation plan definition or provide reference to it.	Clarify preservation plan definition or provide reference to it.	
TABLE 23-4D-6060(D) Height (2) Building Height Stepback	At Building Height Stepback: What/where is the preservation plan in the note? It is merely 6th Street and Congress Avenue?	Clarify preservation plan definition or provide reference to it.	Clarify preservation plan definition or provide reference to it.	
TABLE 23-4D-6060(E) Encroachments	Consider allowing encroachments into ROW to ensure that pedestrian shade can be provided at 0' setback at DC sites. Draft 3 still states that encroachments into the ROW are not permitted. This is a problem on DC zoned sites where there is no setback required, and where the Downtown Overlay zone requires 75% of a building's frontage along pedestrian priority streets to be shaded with awnings.	Change to allow for encroachments within ROW and clarify the process.	The City/Opticos will clarify the language to allow awnings and canopies to encroach into the ROW with a license agreement. Clarify definition and provide more information regarding "public easement and utility easement."	
23-4D-6060(F) Parking (In Draft 2: Parking, Curb Cut, Drive)	Draft 3 has corrected this by including the exemption. Draft 2: All CC zones (like DC) should be exempted from the Parking Requirements in 23-4D-7070. Many of the regulations in Draft 2 are now in 23-4D-6040 Parking Requirements in Regional Center Zones. See above for recommendations for that section.	See 23-4D-6040 in Regional Center Zones above.	See 23-4D-6040 in Regional Center Zones above.	
TABLE 23-4D-6060(G): Frontages	This requirement (in DC and CC zones and in the Downtown Plan Overlay Zone) is only appropriate for full-block sites. Many, if not most downtown sites, will be unable to comply with the frontage requirements unless all building lobbies are allowed to count towards Commercial Group A compliance. It is too restrictive and prescriptive to allow viable development on <1/2 block sites and should be eliminated or relaxed. There is confusion with the frontage requirements. Draft 2 states that frontages within the DC and CC zoning districts are required to have a minimum of 60% of their street frontage in approved active commercial or civic uses and refers to the Downtown Plan Overlay Zone. However, the Overlay Zone allows ground level residential uses in addition to active commercial and civic uses on non Pedestrian-Activity Streets as per Table 23-4D-9080(A). This is consistent with the intent of the Downtown Austin Plan, however the plan should be updated to reflect the conditions in downtown today. Also the definition of active commercial uses (Commercial Group A in the Downtown Plan Overlay Zone) needs to be clarified or refined to allow for ground level office lobbies. Active frontage requirements are very difficult to achieve on small sites due to the amount of space taken up by parking and loading access, utilities, and egress. If intent is to provide more active pedestrian frontage, consider working with city departments to loosen requirements for many building support spaces (AE vault, fire pump, etc.) to be located directly on ROW - this would have a far greater impact on allowing more active uses to take their place. As stated in Imagine Austin, consider prioritizing downtown density, and more specifically more housing units, over these active street frontage requirements. More people living downtown will create active streets and trigger demand for more retail spaces. If active street frontage is prioritized over density, it may result in too many empty retail spaces while limiting the potential for additional residents to support them.	Create exception for <1/2 block sites. Either significantly reduce the % requirement or only require one block face of the site to comply. Or remove requirement in CC base zone and allow for a district planning process to dictate which streets and which uses are appropriate. And reduce requirements for many building support spaces (AE vault, fire pump, etc.) that must be located directly on ROW.	The definition of active commercial uses (Commercial Group A in the Downtown Plan Overlay Zone) needs to be clarified or refined to allow for ground level office or multi-family lobbies.	A DAP plan amendment (or a special area district plan) would be required.
TABLE 23-4D-6060(H) Impervious Cover	Consider revising CC zone maximum impervious cover from 95% to 100%. 95% maximum forces building setbacks and decreases density. CC zones replace DMU zones in the existing code. DMU allows for 100% impervious cover. CC should not be more restrictive than DMU.	Increase impervious cover and building cover maximums to 100%.		A DAP plan amendment (or a special area district plan) would be required.

Section	Summary/Subject	Solution	Anticipated Corrections for Errata Sheet or Addendum	Needed policy change per City Staff
TABLE 23-4D-6060(I) Open Space	CC zoning requires 5% of the site area to be common open space. The criteria for common open space described in 23-4C-1030 requires that 70% of this space be provided at ground level (or 50% if above-ground common open space is designed as a vegetated/green roof). This language was taken from Sub-chapter E, and should not have been applied to the Downtown. This requirement significantly reduces a small site's ability to accommodate all other code requirements. Consider removing this ground level requirement in CC, DC and UC zoning where there are many small sites, and where podium building types can create high quality common open space above the ground level. At (c) Civic Open Space: There are no sites zoned CC > 4 acres.	Remove requirement for (b) Common Open Space.	Opticos/City plan to remove the Common Open Space standards from all of the Regional Center Zones (CC, UC, DC).	
TABLE 23-4D-6080 (A) Lot Size and Intensity	At FAR max: Consider increasing DC zone FAR maximum to 12:1. There are other zoning designations in Austin that allow 12:1 FAR, such as Robinson Ranch and the Domain. Downtown zones should be granted the same FAR entitlements as any other area in Austin. This supports Imagine Austin's priority of locating the greatest density in regional centers and specifically in downtown. Also, clarify the AHBP Bonus of 4.0 which conflicts with the Downtown Density Bonus Program. Also, at Note 1: this language is taken directly from the Downtown Austin Plan and should be updated. It references districts that are not identified in the code (Waterfront District and Red River District). These FAR exemptions that incentivize certain uses are recommended and support many of the goals of Downtown Plan, but they are being "cut and pasted" too literally and without proper context. Consider removing this from base zoning and using district planning to update the language.	Change DC zone FAR max to 12:1. Clarify the AHBP Bonus of 4.0 which conflicts with the Downtown Density Bonus Program.	Clarify the AHBP Bonus of 4.0 which conflicts with the Downtown Density Bonus Program.	A DAP plan amendment (or a special area district plan) would be required.
TABLE 23-4D-6080(B) Building Placement	Regarding "Additional setback and/or easement may be required where street right of way or utilities easement is required" - where is this addressed in the code? And, at Note 1: section referenced is Industrial Flex Zones and must be incorrect.	Clarify reference to easements. Note 1 section referenced is Industrial Flex Zones and must be incorrect.	Clarify reference to easements. Where is there information or a map of the easements? Correct section referenced in Note 1.	
TABLE 23-4D-6080(C) Building Form	At Note 3, reference to Common Open Space is likely an error. Common Open Space requirements for downtown zones are to be removed in the Addendum. CC zone references Civic Open Space - is this correct?	At Note 3, change Common Open Space to 23-4C-1030 Civic Open Space.	At Note 3, change Common Open Space to 23-4C-1030 Civic Open Space.	
TABLE 23-4D-6080(D) Height	At Building Height Stepback: What/where is the preservation plan in the note? It is merely 6th Street and Congress Avenue?	Clarify preservation plan definition or provide reference to it.	Clarify preservation plan definition or provide reference to it.	
TABLE 23-4D-6080(G): Frontages	This requirement (in DC and CC zones and in the Downtown Plan Overlay Zone) is only appropriate for full-block sites. Many, if not most downtown sites, will be unable to comply with the frontage requirements unless all building lobbies are allowed to count towards Commercial Group A compliance. It too restrictive and prescriptive to allow viable development on <1/2 block sites and should be eliminated or relaxed. There is confusion with the frontage requirements. Draft 2 states that frontages within the DC and CC zoning districts are required to have a minimum of 60% of their street frontage in approved active commercial or civic uses and refers to the Downtown Plan Overlay Zone. However, the Overlay Zone allows ground level residential uses in addition to active commercial and civic uses on non Pedestrian-Activity Streets as per Table 23-4D-9080(A). This is consistent with the intent of the Downtown Austin Plan, however the plan should be updated to reflect the conditions in downtown today. Also the definition of active commercial uses (Commercial Group A in the Downtown Plan Overlay Zone) needs to be clarified or refined to allow for ground level office lobbies. Active frontage requirements are very difficult to achieve on small sites due to the amount of space taken up by parking and loading access, utilities, and egress. If intent is to provide more active pedestrian frontage, consider working with city departments to loosen requirements for many building support spaces (AE vault, fire pump, etc.) to be located directly on ROW - this would have a far greater impact on allowing more active uses to take their place. As stated in Imagine Austin, consider prioritizing downtown density, and more specifically more housing units, over these active street frontage requirements. More people living downtown will create active streets and trigger demand for more retail spaces. If active street frontage is prioritized over density, it may result in too many empty retail spaces while limiting the potential for additional residents to support them. Additionally, consider revising the requirement that prohibits stairs/ramps in required setbacks to allowing them in required setbacks.	Create exception for <1/2 block sites. Either significantly reduce the % requirement or only require one block face of the site to comply. Or remove requirement in DC base zone and allow for a district planning process to dictate which streets and which uses are appropriate. And reduce requirements for many building support spaces (AE vault, fire pump, etc.) that must be located directly on ROW. The definition of active commercial uses (Commercial Group A in the Downtown Plan Overlay Zone) needs to be clarified or refined to allow for ground level office or multi-family lobbies. Additionally, revise the requirement that prohibits stairs/ramps in required setbacks to allow them in required setbacks.	The definition of active commercial uses (Commercial Group A in the Downtown Plan Overlay Zone) needs to be clarified or refined to allow for ground level office or multi-family lobbies.	A DAP plan amendment (or a special area district plan) would be required.
TABLE 23-4D-6080(I) Open Space	DC zoning requires 5% of the site area to be common open space. The criteria for common open space described in 23-4C-1030 requires that 70% of this space be provided at ground level (or 50% if above-ground common open space is designed as a vegetated/green roof). This language was taken from Sub-chapter E, and should not have been applied to the Downtown. This requirement significantly reduces a small site's ability to accommodate all other code requirements. Consider removing this ground level requirement in CC, DC and UC zoning where there are many small sites, and where podium building types can create high quality common open space above the ground level.	Remove requirement for (b) Common Open Space.	Opticos/City plan to remove the Common Open Space standards from all of the Regional Center Zones (CC, UC, DC).	
TABLE 23-4D-6080(J) Additional Standards	Consider allowing LEED certification as a substitute for Austin Energy Green Building rating.	Add "or at least the minimum level LEED Certification as a substitute for Austin Energy Green Building rating."		
23-4D-6080(K) Additional Compatibility	To better align this with 23-4D-6080(B)(2), add "except for additional setbacks or height stepbacks."	Add "except for additional setbacks or height stepbacks."	Add "except for additional setbacks or height stepbacks."	
Division 23-4D-7: Commercial and Industrial Zones				
Division 23-4D-8: Other Zones				
Division 23-4D-9: Overlay Zones				

Section	Summary/Subject	Solution	Anticipated Corrections for Errata Sheet or Addendum	Needed policy change per City Staff
23-4D-9080(B) Boundaries Defined & Figure 23-4D-9080(1)	At (2): clarify the conflicts between the Pedestrian Activity Streets listed and those shown on the map on Figure 23-4D-9080(1) or delete street list and refer to the figure. Streets on map that are not listed at (2): Second Street, Sabine Street, Waller Creek, East 6th Street. Streets listed at (2) not on the map: Red River Street.	At (2): clarify the conflicts between the Pedestrian Activity Streets listed and those shown on the map on Figure 23-4D-9080(1) or delete street list and refer to the figure. Streets on map that are not listed at (2): Second Street, Sabine Street, Waller Creek, East 6th Street. Streets listed at (2) not on the map: Red River Street.	At (2): clarify the conflicts between the Pedestrian Activity Streets listed and those shown on the map on Figure 23-4D-9080(1) or delete street list and refer to the figure. Streets on map that are not listed at (2): Second Street, Sabine Street, Waller Creek, East 6th Street. Streets listed at (2) not on the map: Red River Street.	
23-4D-9080(C) Ground Floor Use Requirements	(2) Allowed Uses: Table 23-4D-9080(B) Allowed Uses for the Downtown Plan Overlay Zone has changed to reflect a new category called "Business and Financial/Professional Uses" in Commercial Group A. Was this added to address office or mixed-use building lobbies? The expanded definition on page 13A-2, pg 4 does not specifically include that term or refer to accessory spaces supporting the Business/Financial uses therein. Thus, it's unclear whether lobbies are still excluded from Commercial Group A. There is another new Allowed Use called "Office, General (Non-Medical)" under Commercial Group B. Once again, the definition doesn't include the word lobby or reference accessory uses that could reasonably infer lobbies. Office, residential, and mixed use building lobbies should be specifically added to the Commercial Group A list to remove any confusion. If this is not done, small sites (<1/2 block) will not be able to meet this requirement and will be economically not viable, therefore disincentivizing development and density on the only type of available sites left in downtown.	Office, residential, and mixed use building lobbies should be specifically added to the Commercial Group A list to include lobbies as an allowed use.	Office lobbies should be allowed as an active commercial use in Commercial Group A in the Downtown Plan Overlay Zone 23-4D-9080.	A DAP plan amendment (or a special area district plan) may be required.
23-4D-9080(D)(1) Development Standards: Driveways, Curb	Add Refer to Figure 23-4D-9080(1) Pedestrian Activity Street. Consider allowing an exception for corner sites that have frontage on two Pedestrian Activity Streets. These sites will not be allowed any vehicular entry into the site and could reduce the viability of high-rise commercial or multi-family projects that want to include a parking garage.	Add Refer to Figure 23-4D-9080(1) Pedestrian Activity Street. Add "exception for corner sites that have frontage on two Pedestrian Activity Streets. These sites will be allowed either a driveway or curb onto the street determined to be secondary of the two streets at the site, or during review process."	Add Refer to Figure 23-4D-9080(1) Pedestrian Activity Street.	A DAP plan amendment (or a special area district plan) may be required.
23-4D-9080(D)(2) Treatment of Commercial Building Fronts	Clarify if the definition of commercial building in this context includes multi-family residential uses.	Clarify if the definition of commercial building in this context includes multi-family residential uses.	Clarify if the definition of commercial building in this context includes multi-family residential uses.	
	At (a) Minimum Shade Note 3: Clarify if street trees are an acceptable shade device substitute for an awning or canopy. It is recommended to allow this to encourage Great Streets sidewalks which include trees.	At Note 3: Add "street trees are an acceptable shade device if they provide shade in front of the required area."	Clarify if street trees are an acceptable shade device substitute for an awning or canopy.	
	At (a) Minimum Shade Note 3: This requirement will likely force a project to seek a license agreement from the City because they will not want to push the building back to accommodate an awning or canopy. License agreements will incur additional costs and time.			
23-4D-9080(D)(4) Setbacks	At (a) Front Setbacks (i) and Figure 23-4D-9080(2) Minimum Front Setback Requirements: Figure (2) shows setbacks greater than 5 feet on many CC zoned sites. Remove setbacks greater than 5' except when a site is within a block with existing greater setbacks. Allow any more restrictive setback requirements to be developed through a district planning process. This Figure is outdated and does not show the new Medical Campus, State Capitol Complex. And development with no setbacks has occurred on streets with >5' setbacks.	At (a) Front Setbacks (i) and Figure 23-4D-9080(2) Minimum Front Setback Requirements: Remove setbacks greater than 5' except when a site is within a block with existing greater setbacks. Or At (a) Front Setbacks (i) change to "Minimum front setback is 5' or equal to existing adjacent block front setback when site is within a block with existing greater setbacks" and delete the Figure (2) map until an updated map developed during a district planning process can be codified.		A DAP plan amendment (or a special area district plan) may be required.
23-4D-9080(E) Compatibility	This is exactly the kind of inefficient, overlapping regulation CodeNEXT is supposed to resolve. This section is redundant and could be removed entirely. The compatibility requirements built into the base zones of Draft 3 already achieve the desired height restrictions to within 5' of the maximum heights listed in Table 23-4D-9080(E). For example, if you compare the zones mapped in these areas with the heights, only one zone is required to reduce height by 5'. If you compare the setback requirements, there are greater minimums shown in the table, but this could be achieved by a district planned map that should replace Figure 23-4D-9080(2) Minimum Front Setback Requirements. i.e. the intent of this section could be achieved by mapping the base zones accordingly. Isn't that why compatibility was built in to the base zones in Draft 3?	Remove this section. Use base zoning compatibility and the mapping of the zones to achieve the intent of the Downtown Austin Plan. If more restrictive requirements are necessary, use a new district planning process to create additional requirements.		A DAP plan amendment (or a special area district plan) may be required.
23-4D-9080(F) Screening	At (2) Additional Screening Requirements for a Parking Structure: These requirements will likely be covered in the Criteria Manual for parking garages. If so, remove them from this section to avoid redundancy.	If these requirements will be covered in the Criteria Manual for parking garages, remove them from this section to avoid redundancy.	If these requirements will be covered in the Criteria Manual for parking garages, remove them from this section to avoid redundancy.	
	At (3) Surface Parking Facility: Confirm that surface parking facilities are an allowed use in the affected base zones. See 23-4D-6030 Allowed Uses and Permit Requirements	At (3) Surface Parking Facility: Confirm that surface parking facilities are an allowed use in the affected base zones. See 23-4D-6030 Allowed Uses and Permit Requirements	At (3) Surface Parking Facility: Confirm that surface parking facilities are an allowed use in the affected base zones. See 23-4D-6030 Allowed Uses and Permit Requirements	
Article 23-4E: Supplemental to Zones				
Division 23-4E-1: Private Frontages				
Division 23-4E-2: Outdoor Lighting				
Division 23-4E-3: Parking and Loading				
23-4E-3080 Bike Parking	"Consider adjusting bike parking requirements to allow non-visitor bike parking to be located in a more remote, secure location. Consider allowing sidewalk bike racks located in the ROW to count towards visitor bike parking requirements. "			
Division 23-4E-4: Landscape				

Section	Summary/Subject	Solution	Anticipated Corrections for Errata Sheet or Addendum	Needed policy change per City Staff
23-4E-4	Requirements of application of Function Green shall be codified including: what sites are required to comply, to what % are sites required to comply, which team has review authority over decisions, what is allowed to overlap (trees, water quality, other) and what is not, and what land can be used for compliance (private land only, parkland, ROW, easements, etc).			
23-4E-4040	CC Zone Section D: Building Placement and Form, requires a minimum setback and this triggers front yard planting requirements. It will be impossible or very difficult for <1/2 block sites to accommodate these landscaping requirements, specifically, planting area and ornamental trees. For the sites tested, the areas and number of trees is much greater than the site frontage available. Consider exempting CC and DC zones (and any other urban zones) from this section as written (and it is recommended that CC does not require any minimum setback).		Sites >80% impervious cover will not be subject to the landscape standards, but will be required to comply with Functional Green, which offers a range of options (e.g., green roofs, trees, rain gardens, etc.)	
23-4E-4090	We cannot find where this category is used in the code. It should be allowed and used for compatibility as the 20 ft tall buffer is onerous from a cost perspective.		This should be considered for the Errata Sheet	
23-4E-4120	This sections is missing in its entirety.	Details need to be included in the code and supplemented by the criteria manual before CodeNext is adopted.		
Division 23-4E-5: Docks, Bulkheads, and Shoreline				
Division 23-4E-6: Specific to Use				
Division 23-4E-6: Specific to Use				
Division 23-4E-7: Additional General Standards				
Division 23-4E-8: Building Design Standards				
Chapter 23-5: Subdivision				
Article 23-5A: Introduction				
Division 23-5A-1: General Provisions				
Article 23-5B: Subdivision Procedures				
Division 23-5B-1: General Requirements				
Division 23-5B-2: Preliminary Subdivision Plan				
Division 23-5B-3: Final Subdivision Plat				
Division 23-5B-4: Changes to Recorded Plats				

Section	Summary/Subject	Solution	Anticipated Corrections for Errata Sheet or Addendum	Needed policy change per City Staff
Division 23-5B-5: Subdivision Construction Plan				
Article 23-5C: Platting Requirements				
Division 23-5C-1: Property Markers, Easements, and Alleys				
Division 23-5C-2: Lots				
Division 23-5C-3: Utilities				
Division 23-5C-4: Trees for Residential Subdivision				
Chapter 23-6: Site Plan				
Article 23-6A: Purpose and Applicability				
Division 23-6A-1: Purpose and Applicability				
Division 23-6A-2: Exemptions				
Article 23-6B: Site Plan Review and Filing Requirements				
Division 23-6B-1: Application Review and Approval				
Division 23-6B-2: Submittal Waivers				
Division 23-6B-3: Release				
Article 23-6C: Expiration				
Division 23-6C-1: Expiration				
Chapter 23-7: Building, Demolition, and Relocation Permits; Special Requirement Permits For Historic Structures				
Article 23-7A: General Provisions				
Division 23-7A-1: General Provisions				
Article 23-7B: Building Demolition and Permits				
Division 23-7B-1: Building and Demolition Permits				

Section	Summary/Subject	Solution	Anticipated Corrections for Errata Sheet or Addendum	Needed policy change per City Staff
Division 23-7B-2: Permit Applications				
Division 23-7B-3: Demolition Permit Expiration and Extension				
Article 23-7C: Relocation Permits				
Division 23-7C-1: Relocation Permits				
Division 23-7C-2: Relocation Requirements				
Article 23-7D: Special Requirements for Historic Properties and Buildings 45 or More Years Old				
Division 23-7D-1: Overview				
Division 23-7D-2: Properties with Historic Designation				
Division 23-7D-3: Properties without Historic Designation				
Division 23-7D-4: Pending Historic Designations				
Division 23-7D-5: Appeal				
Article 23-7E: Maintenance Requirements				
Division 23-7E-1: Maintenance Requirements				
Article 23-7F: Enforcement and Penalties				
Division 23-7F-1: Demolition by Neglect and New Construction				
Chapter 23-8: Signage				
ARTICLE 23-8A: General Provisions				
Division 23-8A-1: Policy and Administration				
Division 23-8A-2: Sign Permits and Registration				
ARTICLE 23-8C: Regulations Applicable To Sign Districts and Sign Types				
Division 23-8B-1: General Requirements				

Section	Summary/Subject	Solution	Anticipated Corrections for Errata Sheet or Addendum	Needed policy change per City Staff
Division 23-8B-2: On-Premise Signs Allowed Without a Permit				
Division 23-8B-3: Prohibited Signs				
Division 23-8B-4: Nonconforming Signs				
ARTICLE 23-8C: Regulations Applicable To Sign Districts and Sign Types				
Division 23-8C-1: Regulations by Sign District and Sign Overlay				
23-8C-1010: Purpose and Applicability				
23-8C-1020: Sign District Regulations				
23-8C-1030: Historic Sign District				
23-8C-1040: Expressway Corridor Sign District				
23-8C-1050: Scenic Roadway Sign District				
23-8C-1060: Residential House-Scale Sign District				
23-8C-1070: Residential Multi-Unit Sign District				
23-8C-1080 Neighborhood Commercial Sign District				
23-8C-1090 Regional Center Sign District				
23-8C-1100 Standard Sign District				
23-8C-1110 Pedestrian Oriented Sign Overlay				
Division 23-8C-2: Regulation by Sign Type				
23-8C-2010 Purpose and Applicability				
23-8C-2020 Standards for Building-Mounted Signs				
23-8C-2030 Awning or Canopy Sign				
23-8C-2040 Changeable Copy Sign				

Section	Summary/Subject	Solution	Anticipated Corrections for Errata Sheet or Addendum	Needed policy change per City Staff
23-8C-2050 Landscape Wall Sign				
23-8C-2060 Marquee Sign				
23-8C-2070 Porch Sign				
23-8C-2080 Projecting Sign				
23-8C-2090 Roof Sign				
23-8C-2100 Suspended Sign				
23-8C-2110 Wall Sign				
23-8C-2120 Wall Mural Sign				
23-8C-2130 Window Sign				
23-8C-2140 Standards for Freestanding Signs				
Division 23-8C-3: Regulations for Non-Standard Signs				
23-8C-3010 Purpose and Applicability				
23-8C-3020 Standards for Temporary Signs				
23-8C-3030 Standards for Street Banners				
23-8C-3040 Standards for Special Event Signs				
ARTICLE 23-8D: Enforcement and Relief Procedures				
Division 23-8D-1: Enforcement				
23-8D-1010 Enforcement and Violations				
23-8D-1020 Abandoned Signs				
23-8D-1040 Penalties for Signs on Public Property				
Division 23-8D-2: Variances and Appeals				

Section	Summary/Subject	Solution	Anticipated Corrections for Errata Sheet or Addendum	Needed policy change per City Staff
23-8D-2010 Board of Adjustment Sign Variances				
23-8D-2020 Administrative Sign Modifications				
23-8D-2030 Appeals				
Chapter 23-9: Transportation	Process language shall be included in code that clarifies transportation study review timelines clearly so the process is transparent.			
23-9 (generally)	Process language shall be included in code that clarifies transportation study review timelines clearly so the process is transparent.			
23-9 (generally)	Code should include by-right waiver of TIAs and TDMs in downtown/CBD/TOD projects.			
23-9 (generally)	Need to evaluate the life span of an approved TIA/TDM and attach with a site plan but not put an arbitrary life associated with it. TIAs/TDMs should not have a limited lifespan along corridors.			
Article 23-9A: General Provisions				
Division 23-9A-1: Policy and Administration				
Division 23-9A-2: Proportionality of Transportation Infrastructure Requirements				
23-9A-2	Rough Proportionality evaluation process should occur during predevelopment process (see first comment) or have a separate 30 day max review process for list of included/qualified RP improvements and estimated cost. Process for submittal and review of RP evaluation shall be defined in code and completely offline/ahead of TIA, TDM, or other traffic study review.			
23-9A-2	Policies regarding what is considered part of a project rough proportionality shall be included in code, not criteria manual. This includes definition of "Municipal transportation infrastructure improvements" (23-9A-1050)			
Article 23-9B: Right-Of-Way Dedication and Reservation				
Division 23-9B-1: General Provisions				
Division 23-9B-2: Right-Of-Way Dedication and Improvement				
23-9B-2010	Remove allowance for staff to require ROW dedication outside of a site plan boundary.			
Division 23-9B-3: Right-Of-Way Reservation				
Article 23-9C: Transportation Review and Analysis				
Division 23-9C-1: General Provisions				
23-9C-1	TIA threshold needs to be evaluated and modified based on alternate methodology that aligns with method of study/determination of impact at intersections (such as peak hour analysis).			
23-9C-1010	Language should be modified as mitigation is not always an option for new development in urban environments	Language needs to allow for infill development on congested streets that increases transit ridership over time. Language shall be crafted such that infill development is not restricted.		

Section	Summary/Subject	Solution	Anticipated Corrections for Errata Sheet or Addendum	Needed policy change per City Staff
Division 23-9C-2: Comprehensive Transportation Review				
23-9C-2	Transportation Demand Management Plans and requirement in lieu of/along side a TIA needs to be clarified.	This becomes part of a predevelopment meeting and predevelopment summary identifies any/all studies required.		
Section 23-9C-2020 (C)(1)(a) & (b)	Under this section TIAs would not be required for zoning cases, except for PUDs; however, it also states that City Council may require a TIA for any zoning case. The concern is that at the public hearing stage before council it's would be too late to do a TIA. It is likely that requiring a TIA at that point could set a project back 9 months to a year, assuming staff takes the same amount of time to review it as it does other TIAs. TIAs should either be required for zoning cases or they shouldn't. If they are required at zoning, then the time period for which they are considered valid should be increased beyond the currently proposed five (5) years.	Do not require them at zoning and make it clear to both City Council and others that a TIA will be performed at the time of site plan submittal.		
Division 23-9C-3: Neighborhood Transportation Impact Analysis				
23-9C-3020	Clear definition is needed of multi-modal level of service	Code should include list of allowed/approved "modes" and goals regarding mode split for purpose of implementing code policies regarding redirecting traffic to other modes		
Article 23-9D: Development Conditions and Mitigation				
Division 23-9D-1: Action on Development Application				
23-9D-1030	Under this section, the City would be allowed to delay a project until certain improvements have been constructed. It also states that the Director may also lower density of the development to match capacity of the transportation network. The first option of delay not a viable option for a project that is otherwise developable. It also contradicts Imagine Austin, as well as other sections which request more density in certain areas such as the corridors.	Language allowing project delay or density reduction by director based on transportation issues should be removed for all projects. Another suggestion: Any project with 800 units/800,000 sf or less will not be subject to reduced density regardless of the level of service to the main street it fronts.	Consider for Errata Sheet	
Division 23-9D-2: Transportation Infrastructure Improvements				
Article 23-9E: Right-Of-Way Construction				
Division 23-9E-1: General Provisions				
Division 23-9E-2: Construction License				
Division 23-9E-3: Right-Of-Way Permit				
Division 23-9E-4: General Design and Maintenance Requirements				
Division 23-9E-5: Driveways and Alleys				
Division 23-9E-6: Sidewalks, Urban Trails, and Street Trees				
Article 23-9F: Street Design				
Division 23-9F-1: General Provisions				
Division 23-9F-2: Access to Major Streets				

Section	Summary/Subject	Solution	Anticipated Corrections for Errata Sheet or Addendum	Needed policy change per City Staff
Division 23-9F-3: Street Layout				
Article 23-9G: Road Utility Districts				
Division 23-9G-1: Approval of Petition				
Division 23-9G-2: Construction of Facilities				
Chapter 23-10: Infrastructure				
Article 23-10A: Austin Water Service				
Division 23-10A-1: General Provisions				
Division 23-10A-2: Extension of Service, General Provisions				
Division 23-10A-3: Extension of Service, Cost Participation				
Division 23-10A-4: Tap Permits				
Article 23-10B: Water Districts				
Division 23-10B-1: General Provisions				
Division 23-10B-2: Procedure for Creation				
Division 23-10B-3: Conditions and Restrictions on Consent to Creation of District				
Division 23-10B-4: Out-of-District Service				
Division 23-10B-5: Amendment to a Consent Document or an Agreement with a District				
Division 23-10B-6: District Bond Issuance				
Article 23-10C: Water and Wastewater Impact Fees				
Division 23-10C-1: General Provisions				
Division 23-10C-2: Fee Established				
Division 23-10C-3: Determination of Service Units				

Section	Summary/Subject	Solution	Anticipated Corrections for Errata Sheet or Addendum	Needed policy change per City Staff
Division 23-10C-4: Exemptions				
Division 23-10C-5: Discounts and Adjustments				
Article 23-10D: Reclaimed Water				
Division 23-10D-1: Reclaimed Water				
Article 23-10E: Drainage				
Division 23-10E-1: General Provisions				
Division 23-10E-2: Drainage Studies; Erosion Hazard Analysis; Floodplain Delineation				
Division 23-10E-3: Standards for Approval				
23-10E-3010	Propose modification to 23-10E-3010 requiring detention for redeveloped sites to predevelopment conditions	<p>Proposal would include the following alternative options for sites in an urban/suburban watershed that are also along a corridor, within 1/2 mile of transit or within a TOD:</p> <p>(a) Option to develop to existing site impervious cover with 75% water quality volume compliance and detention required up to the 10 year storm for the full impervious cover.</p> <p>(b) Option to develop to reduce existing impervious cover by 10% with 75% water quality volume compliance and no detention required.</p> <p>(c) Option to develop above existing site impervious (if allowed by zoning/watershed code) with full water quality compliance and detention of new impervious to 100 year storm and existing impervious cover to 25 year storm.</p>		
Division 23-10E-4: Special Standards in Zoning Jurisdiction				
Division 23-10E-5: Responsibilities of Applicant or Owner				
Chapter 23-11: Technical Codes (work in-progress)				
Article 23-11A: Introduction				
Article 23-11B: Technical Codes				
Division 23-11B-1: Building Code				
Division 23-11B-2: Food Establishments				
Division 23-11B-3: Reserved				
Division 23-11B-4: Electrical Code				
Division 23-11B-5: Mechanical Code				

Section	Summary/Subject	Solution	Anticipated Corrections for Errata Sheet or Addendum	Needed policy change per City Staff
Division 23-11B-6: Plumbing Code				
Division 23-11B-7: Fire Code				
Division 23-11B-8: Solar Energy Code				
Division 23-11B-9: Property Maintenance Code				
Division 23-11B-10: Reserved				
Division 23-11B-11: Residential Code				
Division 23-11B-12: Energy Code				
Article 23-11C: Administration of Technical Codes				
Chapter 23-12: Airport Hazard and Compatible Land Use				
Article 23-12A: General Provisions				
Division 23-12A-1: Height Limits and Airport Hazards				
Division 23-12A-2: Compatible Land Uses				
Division 23-12A-3: Nonconforming Uses, Structures, and Objects; Marking and Lighting				
Division 23-12A-4: Permits				
Chapter 23-13: Definitions and Measurements				
Article 23-13A: Definitions and Measurements				
Division 23-13A-1: Terms and Measurements				
Division 23-13A-2: Land Uses				